

PERFORMANCE	Thelipe	D./ED 4.	~~~	
PERFURMANCE	IRENDS	UVER 4	TEAR I	

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Good	Excellent	N/A
2002	Good	Below Average	N/A
2003	Average	Below Average	N/A
2004			

		Our Schoo	High Schools with Students Like Ours			
Percent	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
Passed all 3 subtests	66.3	66.7	57.6	63.0	64.9	63.4
Passed 2 subtests	17.9	13.2	18.8	19.0	17.5	17.8
Passed 1 subtest	11.6	11.4	12.9	10.7	10.8	11.1
Passed no subtests	4.2	8.8	10.6	7.4	6.7	7.1

Male 30 96.7 48 2.1 55 63.6 Female 50 94.0 56 14.3 55 90.9 Race or Ethnic Group African American 26 88.5 37 0.0 42 69.0 Hispanic N/A N/A 1 1/S 1 1/S White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8	PERFORMANCE BY 5	TUDENT	GROUPS				
All Students 80 95.0 104 8.7 110 77.3 Gender Male 30 96.7 48 2.1 55 63.6 Female 50 94.0 56 14.3 55 90.9 Race or Ethnic Group African American 26 88.5 37 0.0 42 69.0 Hispanic N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8 Other 1 I/S 1 I/S 1 I/S Disability Status Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status				Eligibility Scholar	for LIFE ships*	Graduati	on Rate
Gender Male 30 96.7 48 2.1 55 63.6 Female 50 94.0 56 14.3 55 90.9 Race or Ethnic Group African American 26 88.5 37 0.0 42 69.0 Hispanic N/A N/A 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2 84.2	All Students						- ' -
Female 50 94.0 56 14.3 55 90.9 Race or Ethnic Group African American 26 88.5 37 0.0 42 69.0 Hispanic N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8 Other 1 I/S 1 I/S 1 I/S Disability Status Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 <	Gender		00.0	101	0.7	110	77.0
Race or Ethnic Group African American 26 88.5 37 0.0 42 69.0 Hispanic N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8 Other 1 I/S 1 I/S 1 I/S 1 I/S Disability Status Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 <	Male	30	96.7	48	2.1	55	63.6
African American 26 88.5 37 0.0 42 69.0 Hispanic N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8 Other 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 </td <td>Female</td> <td>50</td> <td>94.0</td> <td>56</td> <td>14.3</td> <td>55</td> <td>90.9</td>	Female	50	94.0	56	14.3	55	90.9
Hispanic N/A N/A 1 1/S 1 1/S White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8 Other 1 1/S 1 1/S 1 1/S 1 1/S	Race or Ethnic Group						
White 53 98.1 65 13.8 66 81.8 Other 1 I/S 1 I/S 1 I/S Disability Status Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	African American	26	88.5	37	0.0	42	69.0
Other 1 I/S 1 I/S 1 I/S Disability Status Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Emplish Proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	•			1		1	
Disability Status Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Emplish Proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	White	53		65	13.8	66	81.8
Non-speech disabilities 1 I/S 7 0.0 9 0.0 Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Emitted English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Other	1	I/S	1	I/S	1	I/S
Students without disabilities 79 94.9 97 9.3 101 84.2 Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Emplish Proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Disability Status						
Migrant Status Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Emplish Proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Non-speech disabilities	1	I/S	7	0.0	9	0.0
Migrant N/A N/A 0 N/A 0 N/A Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Value Value VS 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Students without disabilities	79	94.9	97	9.3	101	84.2
Non-migrant N/A N/A 104 8.7 0 N/A English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Migrant Status						
English Proficiency Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Migrant	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Limited English proficient N/A N/A 1 I/S 1 I/S Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Non-migrant	N/A	N/A	104	8.7	0	N/A
Non-LEP 80 95.0 103 8.7 109 77.1 Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	English Proficiency						
Lunch Status Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Limited English proficient	N/A	N/A	1	I/S	1	I/S
Subsidized meals 28 89.3 36 5.6 48 58.3	Non-LEP	80	95.0	103	8.7	109	77.1
	Lunch Status						
Full-pay meals 52 98.1 68 10.3 62 91.9	Subsidized meals	28	89.3	36	5.6	48	58.3
	Full-pay meals	52	98.1	68	10.3	62	91.9

Percent of	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours		
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at	8.7	9.8		
four-year institutions*				
Seniors who met the SAT requirement	8.7	10.1		
Seniors who met the grade point average	44.2	49.2		

^{*}Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

North Central Hi	ah 28	301003

SCHOOL PROFILE				
	OurSchool	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
Students (n= 502)				
Retention rate Attendance rate	14.2% 94.7%	Up from 6.9% Down from 95.2%	8.8% 95.5%	7.3% 95.5%
Eligible for gifted and talented With disabilities other than speech	0.0% 12.4%	Down from 10.0% Up from 11.5%	0.1% 13.0%	5.1% 12.2%
Older than usual for grade Suspended or expelled	9.8% 2.6%	Up from 6.2% Up from 1.3%	10.6% 2.6%	10.1% 2.3%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs Successful on AP/IB exams	10.4% N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	10.2% N/A
Annual dropout rate Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	1.0% 10.4%	Down from 1.1% Up from 8.1%	2.7% 5.7%	2.7% 3.2%
Enrollment in career/technology center courses	r 244	Up from 199	536	433
Students participating in worked-based experiences	0.0%	Down from 16.7%	29.4%	26.3%
Career/technology students mastering core competencies	86.6%	Up from 85.0%	75.0%	74.9%
Career/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	99.4%	99.5%
Teachers (n= 30)				
Teachers with advanced degrees Continuing contract teachers	40.0% 90.0%	Up from 39.1% Up from 80.4%	46.3% 77.6%	51.7% 81.8%
Highly qualified teachers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teachers returning from previous year		Down from 89.1%	84.2%	85.1%
Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary	96.3% \$38,447	Up from 96.1% Up 4.1%	95.4% \$39,785	95.8% \$40,303
Prof. development days/teacher	12.7 days	Up from 10.8 days	10.3 days	10.3 days
School				
Principal's years at school Student-teacher ratio	6.0 26.5 to 1	Up from 5.0 Down from 28.6 to 1	4.0 26.5 to 1	3.0 26.2 to 1
Prime instructional time Dollars spent per pupil*	90.0% \$5,344	Down from 90.2% Down 4.1%	89.8% \$6,261	90.1% \$6,279
Percent spent on teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts	53.6% Good	Up from 51.8% Down from Excellent	56.5% Excellent	57.8% Excellent
Parents attending conferences SACS accreditation	92.1% yes	Down from 97.7% N/A	91.9% yes	87.8% yes
			•	•

^{*} Prior year audited financial data are reported.

	Our District	State	
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools	N/A	N/A	
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools	N/A	N/A	

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A Not Applicable	N/C Not Collected	N/R Not Reported	I/S Insufficient Sample

North Central High 2801003

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

North Central High School (NCHS) is located in Kershaw County and serves students in grades 9-12. NCHS is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and is committed to providing students with the academic preparation and extracurricular programs necessary for students to successfully perform in both post-secondary institutions and the workplace.

During 2002-2003, the Kershaw County School District and North Central High School were expected to continue to attain high levels of academic achievement even though state budget cuts reduced both staffing and program offerings. This is the second year that budget reductions have impacted staffing and program offerings at NCHS. In spite of the financial situation, the faculty, staff, students, and parents continued to commit to excellence and to do their best. The financial crisis had a negative impact last year on a number of areas at North Central including student achievement. In previous years, NCHS has attained "excellent" and "good" absolute report card ratings, which measured student achievement gains.

In 2002-2003, NCHS maintained a 90% graduation rate for the fourth year in a row. The number of students qualifying for the all A and A/B Honor Roll continued to grow. A number of students received scholarships to two and four year post-secondary institutions, and students were named to the All County Academic team, SAT Honor Court, Junior Scholars, Academic All-State team, and Palmetto Fellows. One student received the Governor's Citizenship award. Several NCHS students who attend the Applied Technology Education Campus won in region and state competition levels in their respective career and technology areas, and some competed nationally in Kansas City, Kansas last summer.

Six North Central teams qualified for state playoffs. Girls track and boys track teams won region championships. NCHS students were named state champions in individual wresting competition and in track and field. The boys and girls track and field coaches were named Region Coaches of the Year. The yearbook won Superior, and the Marching Knights Band placed tenth in state competition. A North Central JROTC cadet was selected as one of the top cadets in the nation after being recognized as a top region and state JROTC cadet.

During the 2002-2003 school year, NCHS faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members began the self-evaluation process for school improvement as the school seeks renewal of its Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation. NCHS will complete this process in the fall of 2003.

Dr. Agnes Slayman, Principal 2002-2003

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS						
	Teachers	Students	Parents			
Number of surveys returned	37	75	27			
Percent satisfied with learning environment	88.9%	76.0%	70.4%			
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	94.4%	78.4%	57.7%			
Percent satisfied with home-school relations	62.2%	90.1%	77.8%			

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.